

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

July 5, 2018

TO: Environmental Justice Commissioner Group Meeting

FROM: Clesi Bennett, Coastal Planner (415/352-3613; clesi.bennett@bcdcc.ca.gov)
Shannon Fiala, Planning Manager (415/352-3665; shannon.fiala@bcdcc.ca.gov)
Steve Goldbeck, Chief Deputy Director (415/352-3611; steve.goldbeck@bcdcc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Meeting Summary of June 7, 2018, Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting

1. **Roll Call, Introductions, and Approval of Agenda.** The meeting was called to order by Chair Alvarado (arrived at 11:17 a.m.) at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Claremont Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at 11:12 a.m. Working Group members in attendance included Chair Teresa Alvarado, Commissioner Sheri Pemberton, Commissioner Eddie Ahn, and Commissioner Pat Showalter. Commissioner John Vasquez was not in attendance. Staff in attendance included Chief Deputy Director Steve Goldbeck, Shannon Fiala Planning Manager, Clesi Bennett Planner, Elizabeth Felter Planner, Matthew Trujillo Enforcement Analyst, and Aviva Wolf-Jacobs Intern. Also, in attendance was Claire Bekker with Brightline Defense.

2. **Approval of the April 5, 2018 and May 3, 2018 Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting Minutes.**

Motion: Upon motion by Member Showalter, Seconded by Member Ahn, the minutes were approved by voice vote with no objections or abstentions.

Chief Deputy Director Goldbeck called the meeting to order: Let's get started. Commissioner Alvarado should show up very soon. We can call everything to order and I hereby do so.

We'll wait for introductions until Chair Alvarado gets here. You all have a copy of the agenda and hopefully everybody is okay with it.

We have two sets of minutes from past meetings because the last time we did not have a quorum. For those who did attend those last meetings does anyone have any issues with the minutes of April 5th and May 3rd?

Commissioner Showalter commented: I was here May 3rd and they seem fine.

Commissioner Pemberton replied: I have no issues.

Mr. Goldbeck continued: Let's just start into Item 3, Environmental Justice and Social Equity Bay Plan Amendment timeline.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMISSIONER GROUP SUMMARY
April 5, 2018

3. **Environmental Justice and Social Equity Bay Plan Amendment Timeline Update.**

Planner Clesi Bennett commented: This is something that we talked about doing every meeting. We will be looking back at our timeline and making sure that we are still on schedule since we have a quick timeline.

So far everything is still going along. The changes from last time that you will see are that we have completed some of our initial conversations with groups.

We have done research on best practices, on environmental justice policy development which is what we will be talking about today. We have a public workshop scheduled on the 19th with State Lands and the Coastal Commission which we will also talk about.

The other change that you will see is that instead of doing further public workshops we are considering other options for public engagement which we will also get to later in this meeting.

Nothing else has changed towards the end of the schedule about when the hearings are and what-not.

That is the schedule update. Does anyone have any comments or questions about that? (No comments were voiced)

4. **Update on Public Engagement Process.** Planner Clesi Bennett presented the following: I wanted to update you on where we are in our public engagement process. Last time we had talked about doing one-on-one conversations with different environmental justice groups who have worked on policy development or engagement since we decided not to do a formal, advisory committee but rather engage with folks one-on-one.

We have also been working on planning an environmental justice round table with the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission. That will be on June 19th which is a week from next Tuesday in Oakland.

Luckily State Lands is covering the cost of the venue and food as well. We are quite excited about that. We are working through the agenda of what this round table will look like and what works best for the three different agencies together given some of our overlapping issue areas or jurisdictions. We can get into the details of that if people are interested.

And then going forward we can talk a bit about this in the presentation but we are also considering doing —

(Chair Alvarado arrives)

Chair Alvarado spoke: Hi Teresa. Sorry I'm late.

Ms. Bennett continued: I was just going through some of our public engagement work that we have done so far. Today I am going to present on some of the one-on-one conversations that I have had.

We are in the midst of planning an environmental justice roundtable with the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission which will be a week from next Tuesday in Oakland.

Beyond that I just scheduled a presentation with the Bayview Hunters Point Environmental Justice Response Task Force which is a community group in the Bayview Hunters Point area.

I am working right now to find other groups and different neighborhood associations that would want to talk with us who already have standing meetings. We are trying to go into some of these communities. We will get into the pros and cons of this.

Commissioner Showalter had questions about outreach: Clesi, when I read your email about the workshop I wasn't sure who the audience was. I wasn't sure whether you wanted this to be for staff or for Commissioners or for both or for the public. Let's talk a little bit about that. Who is the audience of this workshop?

Commissioner Pemberton explained: I think the audience is the public, community advocates, people who work on environmental justice issues or are involved in what BCDC does. We will have staff there to help with the event and to listen and learn.

Commissioner Showalter asked: Do you think we should definitely go as Commissioners or do you think that we should let people talk without us and get the report? Sometimes Commissioners are viewed as putting a damper on things.

Commissioner Pemberton replied: My sense is that Commissioners are welcome in a role that would be as a participant without really highlighting or giving special attention to the Commissioners in their capacity as Commissioners.

I think we are expecting a participation that will range from people who are ordinary citizens and people who are savvier and have long histories of professional advocacies. We want to make sure that the space feels welcoming and everyone is comfortable.

Ms. Bennett continued: Does anyone else have any questions about the workshop or about public engagement in general? (No comments were voiced)

Mr. Goldbeck commented: At this point why don't we go around and have introductions. (Attendees introduced themselves)

Ms. Bennett continued: The main thing I wanted to talk to you today about is what I learned from the different one-on-one conversations that I had with some of the environmental justice groups around the Bay Area. From that I have gathered some guiding principles and best practices.

5. Presentations and Discussion of Background Research on Guiding Principles and Recommendations for Environmental Policy.

I am going to give a presentation on some of that now. I will give a little bit of context about some of the groups which led me into viewing this through a three-pronged approach to environmental justice and equity.

I hope that we can have a conversation about how these concepts apply to BCDC and how that would look. Lastly, I've got a couple of questions to pose for the group if we get there.

We are doing a Bay Plan amendment on environmental justice and social equity. Our goal with this amendment is to, "Amend the San Francisco Bay Plan to incorporate principles of environmental justice and social equity into the planning, design and permitting of shoreline projects in and along the San Francisco Bay."

These are the some of the groups that I spoke with or saw them present on the subject matter or I was referenced to a document or report that they have put out on the subject matter.

This leads us into the three objectives of environmental justice and equity. Most of us are familiar with distributional equity which is making sure that our environmental burdens and benefits are equitably distributed and we know we have a history of inequitably distributing environmental harms to low-income communities and communities of color.

Something else that has come out of a lot of these conversations and reports I have read is that in order environmental justice and equity there is these two other aspects which are procedural and structural equity and justice.

Procedural is getting at the role that a lot of these impacted communities would play in terms of achieving environmental justice and making sure that the role that they play is meaningful and they are engaged in such a manner that is appropriate, that is accessible and inclusive, transparent and we will see that there are some roadblocks to doing this.

We want to do this so that we are not missing any vulnerabilities or any community strengths that we may not be able to identify without the help of some of these communities.

Also, there may be some unintended consequences that could negatively impact communities. This is something that they can help us identify.

The third prong of environmental justice that I identified was structural. This revolves around recognizing some of the past harms and some of the underlying inequitable structures that have created and caused some of these larger environmental injustices. This is really important for building trust to enable these communities to participate in a way that really is meaningful and inclusive.

Next, we are going through some examples of how these have played out and what these could mean and might mean for BCDC and the Bay Plan.

Most people already understand distributional equity and injustice. It is looking at the spread of environmental burdens and benefits and trying to figure out how we can make sure that these burdens and benefits are equitably distributed.

So far there are some agencies that have begun to address this. I have for you here some examples of how folks are starting to look at this requiring and putting human health and public health at the center of their policies particularly for communities that have received many of these environmental burdens.

This includes funding these projects and creating discreet projects that benefit these communities.

We are looking at protecting the Bay resources and providing public access for everyone regardless of their race, ethnicity, socio-economic status or place of residence and figuring out if BCDC could prioritize human health.

One of the projects that we are undertaking is looking at past permit approvals to see if we have permitted things that have led to this inequitable distribution of environmental burdens and trying to identify where this has happened and if it has happened, what we could have done better.

Hopefully that will lead to some understanding of how this could look concretely for the agency. We are specifically looking at permits related to industrial development, public access, shoreline protection and mitigation.

On procedural justice this is the participatory part of environmental justice and ensuring that the communities have full access to participate in our processes and our procedures.

Some best practices around this are going into communities and attending their established meetings and showing that agencies are willing to meet communities in their own spaces.

This could include things like contracting and developing partnerships with organizations that can help host workshops and meetings and providing people stipends to participate.

We want to make sure those meetings and public engagement opportunities are located within these communities or at least accessible at the times and dates that are most appropriate for those who want to attend and providing food and drink and child care as well as interpretation and translation as appropriate.

Agencies are also trying to work on responding to input in a better manner including explaining why they may not be able to incorporate all the feedback that they get on certain issues.

Talking to some groups there is becoming a feeling in the Bay Area that organizations are constantly asked about the same issues by different agencies. Sometimes they never hear about their feedback and it goes unnoticed. It is not always reflected in their policy changes or in their programs which has led to the feelings of being used or being burned in certain communities. Some communities have actually pulled back from engaging with agencies because they don't see this feedback going anywhere and it has become almost transactional like checking a box.

Other best practices are making sure all of your materials are translated into the appropriate language for the communities that you are serving and creating different advisory groups for how best to engage with impacted citizens.

There are three options for BCDC pertaining to this amendment and how best we could engage with the public. One option would be to hold bigger workshops around the Bay Area as best as we could. We don't have the ability to ensure that these are accessible. We don't have funding to secure spaces or to provide food or to pay people stipends or even to provide translation.

Option two would be to seek out established, community events, neighborhood association meetings, different environmental justice groups who might be meeting and talking with them and making presentations and perhaps talking with smaller groups.

This demonstrates BCDC's willingness to go where these communities are and meet them where they are at. The larger workshops have the potential to lead to big-group brainstorms which can be great and they can turn out a lot of people. They are also high-risk if they are not advertised well and if they are not bringing the right people out.

These large meetings require a lot of work and funding to put them on well. I have been grappling on what our best path forward might be given our limited resources and the time constraints.

Chair Alvarado enquired: When you were talking about accessibility obviously there is physical accessibility but there is also clarity of wording particularly in the environmental field and the work that we are dealing with. It is very technical at times. How much effort have we put into making sure that our materials are accessible from a level of understanding?

Mr. Goldbeck asked for clarification: Are you talking about the Bay Plan Amendment or are you talking about in general at BCDC?

Chair Alvarado replied: It is both because if we are talking about the Bay Plan Amendment the foundation is a lot of other work that we've done. I am just trying to get a sense of how much we have done.

Ms. Bennett responded: For the Amendment we are going to try to write it as understandable and as clear as possible. In general, I find that compared to some other policies ours is pretty readable. I'm not sure I can speak for permits per se.

Mr. Goldbeck commented: In general, when BCDC was first established the Chair was Mel Lane who was the editor of Sunset Magazine. The staff also had journalists.

From the founding of the agency there was a focus on having documents that were readable and well-presented and simple in journalistic writing. We tried to carry that approach down until today.

The challenge is that we are addressing increasingly technical issues and analyses of looking at environmental harm and endangered species and physical processes of sediment transport in the Bay. It is difficult to talk about those in simple language. We try to do it and

sometimes we could do a better job. On the whole we try our best to do a good job. We need to work on that as well.

There is this whole thing about what level of English do you write for somebody who has a college degree or do you write for somebody who came through high school and that kind of thing.

We have always tried to do that and we are still trying to do that.

Chair Alvarado stated: I think that is the key. We can all do better in everything in our lives. Acknowledging this is really valuable. Incorporating that somewhere within this says that we have an awareness and we have a commitment towards making this work more successfully.

Ms. Bennett added: The ART team has done a decent amount specifically what words they are using to describe things like sea level rise and climate change. They have moved more towards talking about in terms of flooding because people relate to it. They understand that.

Planner Elizabeth Felter commented: We are still working on input from community organizations. It's another thing to plan on using a certain level of language and then actually test it on them. Sometimes we guess right and sometimes we guess wrong.

Commissioner Showalter commented: Your comment about people feeling used in stakeholder processes was interesting. I have certainly come across that over the years. Some people have a real legitimate beef. They've given a lot of time and effort and various agencies just did check the box or even worse, didn't even read the recommendation and this is offensive.

One of the things that is vitally important with this is to make it really clear at the beginning what are you asking for from people. Are you asking for information from people? Are you asking for opinions? Are you asking for them to take part in the process and actually be able to give you – are they part of the decision?

A lot of times in these advisory situations people jump to the conclusion that they are part of the decision when in fact they never were supposed to be part of the decision. But they didn't know that and they behaved in terms of the homework they did as if they were going to be part of the decision. So, they were disappointed.

That is a huge deal.

Mr. Goldbeck chimed in: The transparency and people understanding the context and what it really is; are we taking comment or are we all sitting down and deciding it together? That is really important to have that set up going in and making sure people are clear on this.

Commissioner Showalter continued: At the beginning of your presentation you have, what is the project goal? If you were giving the beginning of a stakeholder meeting right after that or right before that you would say, okay, what do we want from these stakeholders? What is the engagement goal? What do we hope to get because it really has to be front and center so that people don't feel abused?

Ms. Bennett added: What I have been doing so far is trying to see what they envision the best processes are? And what would they engage in? We are now getting to a point where some groups, unless they do have a role in the driver's seat or a role –

Commissioner Showalter interjected: They don't want to engage, that's right.

Ms. Bennett agreed: Yes. And it is because they are being asked so much now that they have the ability to say, well, these people are paying us or these people are contracting us.

Commissioner Showalter stated: There is an iterative process where what you suggested about going out to existing meetings and essentially providing information; this is what we are doing and then saying, would you like to be involved? That is a second step instead of the first step – come to the stakeholder meeting.

Commissioner Pemberton added: I have been hearing from people that there is sort of a double-edged sword because there is often the criticism that peoples' impact input isn't sought out and a criticism that our work is going forward without considering perspectives.

It is a little bit of a double-edged sword but it is important to identify some challenges but still forging ahead so at the end of the day we are confident in saying, we have done everything we can think of to get all of the perspectives that we want to have considered and reflected.

With the going out to community events – what sort of time commitment does this entail? If the meetings are in the evening what is the staff capacity and resources to balance that? What are we gaining for the output?

If it is a lot of evening time do we have staff that can devote time to that? This is something that I would put on the table to think about.

Mr. Goldbeck agreed: That is a real challenge for us. We are a very small, state agency without funds to do a lot of the things that we would like to do here.

We are a regional agency across the entire nine-county Bay Area and there are a lot of different groups within that. How can you engage with some and not the others? How do you do that? I am not sure. There probably are ways and we are going to try to do it. It is a challenge for us as we go in as opposed to the local government that has your local communities and you reach out to those.

It is hard for a 40-person staff with a couple of folks on this to try to talk to everybody in the entire Bay Area about this.

Commissioner Ahn commented: Another basic question on infrastructure is have there been collaborative efforts with other state agencies that have larger resources like MTC and the Air District?

Ms. Bennett answered: We are partnering with State Lands and the Coastal Commission. And State Lands, with funding from the Resources Legacy Fund or their

Commission, is hosting and helping pay for some of the things that are going to be included in our workshop.

We also have within BCDC the Adapting to Rising Tides Program. They are partnering with the Bay Area Regional Health and Inequities Initiative (BARHII) to host some workshops around this issue in specific communities in the fall.

The Air District is also going through their AB 617 workshops as well. We spoke with some of their staff members about distributing flyers at those for us. We were able to go to some of the Resilient by Design community events and talk to folks there. We are trying as best we can to leverage our other state and regional partners who do have a bit more capacity and resources.

Mr. Goldbeck added: The Bay Area Regional Collaborative which is the amalgamation of BCDC and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Air Board District and the Association of Bay Area Governments. We have been discussing at the executive level how we can better work together on this so that we can put efforts and we are not serially going to communities and asking the same questions.

Everybody has maps that show where EJ communities are. They are all different and we are wondering how we can reconcile those. Maybe they can't just be the same because agencies have slightly different missions and such. The Air District is looking at whole air sheds but still we need to be intentional and think about these things.

We are trying the best we can to do that. As you can see we are doing this on a couple of different scales. There is the Bay Area Regional Collaborative GARE training that is being hosted by them for all of us.

Ms. Bennett continued: That is the internal piece of all of this. We are getting staff educated on these issues and why it is important for their work and for the agencies.

And we have a little BCDC cohort that is going through right now and hopefully each year we will have more and more folks. That is the second cohort.

Chair Alvarado commented: I think we start where we are starting. We really can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Given our timeframe and our particular jurisdiction and our mission; if we can identify through the maps that you have areas that are important for us to identify opportunities.

Ms. Bennett stated: I have spent the last couple of weeks taking the handful of areas that Elizabeth has identified and pin pointing different groups who are active in this area.

I have a list going right now and hoping to target certain groups.

Commissioner Showalter asked about publicity: What about the press? Could we conceivably have a letter to the editor that we could try to get into the paper? What about that as a heads-up to the whole community that we are thinking about this? You never get too many words.

There are people in these communities that are very tied into this.

Ms. Bennett added: The other thing we have to do is reach out to our Commissioners who are elected officials in certain jurisdictions and ask them for input on groups that have been active.

Chair Alvarado asked: So you will send that around to us at some point? How are you going to reduce this list? Well maybe it is identifying who is doing what in terms of timeframe and we know what our window is.

Ms. Bennett spoke: And that actually leads to the end of that piece. This helps us take these foundational steps and starting long-term engagement rather than just one event at a time and then we are out of there.

This is part of our Strategic Plan goals which are to improve our engagement long-term with these communities.

Right now, it is not the tightest document of contacts. I plan to put it in a spreadsheet and also identify the ones that look to be the most active and the most responsive.

I have a lot of folks who have posted when their meetings are. A lot of them are at night and on the weekends which I am able to do.

We will do the best we can and try to identify the groups that are the most active and who want to be engaged and go from there.

The Bayview Hunters Point group has come up because they have told us that they want us to come and talk and they seem excited.

Ms. Felter commented: I want to make a point about identifying locations. We are looking at the communities that have been identified in the ART Program. We are looking at social vulnerability and flood risks. That applies to this but those locations weren't identified like looking at other public areas.

Where are the locations of communities that are really hurting for public access? This is something to think about. It is a start.

Ms. Bennett added: Maybe that is something that could come out of Aviva looking at where our permits have been and seeing if there are connections between the communities that are impacted by flooding as well. We are probably going to start with the ones that you have identified that do relate to this.

Commissioner Showalter continued: You had that map last time in our packet of where the EJ communities are. That was interesting.

Ms. Bennett explained: Those were the Bay Area Regional Collaborative maps that overlaid our maps with MTC's maps, Air District's maps and ABAG's maps.

We don't have them printed at this time.

Commissioner Showalter added: It would be nice to have a big one that we could put up on the wall and look at.

Mr. Goldbeck stated: The effort also compared it to the statewide ones.

Ms. Bennett continued: Where we have landed is going into these communities and identifying some of the most active groups and attending some of their events. And where we can leverage resources we will to hold larger events.

Ms. Bennett continued: That brings us to the next column of justice that we have been looking at: structural justice or recognizing and acknowledging some of the inequities that have been created over time that have led to the root causes of some of these distributional inequities and injustices around the region.

Again, we are hoping that through the assessing of our past permits that if we have contributed to some of these inequities to be able to see that. As of right now we have not completed that analysis.

This aspect of it is really crucial for building trust and getting communities to participate. Different agencies are looking at this in different ways. Sometimes they are just creating space in their engagement with the public to allow for the acknowledgement of the dynamics in the room perhaps between government and communities by establishing ground rules, checking in with community leaders and making sure that they feel heard and recognized or going even further in allowing communities to help drive the planning processes to rethink about engagement, the way meetings are run and things like that.

Going through and assessing our past permit approval to see if we have contributed to any kind of injustices is important. We are also looking at the way that we currently do public participation. Are the meetings that we conduct accessible? Right now, they are all here during the work day and in English. That is one thing to think about.

We are also looking at our public, access signage, that is also currently in English.

These are possible ways that we could try to address achieving structural and recognition justice.

Chair Alvarado commented: It might be interesting to think about providing access to staffing opportunities to build in capacity of communities.

Ms. Bennett agreed: Yes. This afternoon, our GARE cohorts from the different Bay Area Regional agencies are meeting and this is one of the ideas that has come up as a priority and something that our cohorts can try to take on this next year. This would be creating opportunities for youth of color, low-income youth to get into regional planning.

Chair Alvarado continued: I was just reading about the New America. They have a fellowship class that is looking at kind of all these same types of issues and I wonder if we could be a program. New America has this program where it is a fellowship program. I will send this to you.

Maybe we could be one of their program projects.

Ms. Bennett stated: That would be wonderful.

Mr. Goldbeck added: We are also a part of the Civic Spark Program which is an AmeriCorp program to work on climate issues but it has interns that come in and work and they focus on folks from these kinds of communities.

Ms. Bennett continued: So that is all I had on my conversations with folks. The details and the notes from the conversations and reports that I was recommended are in the report. You can see in a little more depth where some of this stuff came from. This included an environmental assessment of state agencies that the California Environmental Justice Alliance has been doing for the past couple of years.

We included examples of things that you can do to do this better and things that are setting other agencies back.

Do you think that these three objectives of environmental justice relate to BCDC? Do you think that this is the approach that we should be taking? Do you think we can do it given our limited resources? Any thoughts around the broader picture?

Commissioner Showalter commented: I really like the way that you have identified the distributional, procedural and structural. That is really good thinking. Thanks for that intellectual organization.

The thing that I think is unrealistic for this effort in getting the – I mean, I think we need to be aware of it – but for accomplishing it in this effort of just getting the policy language for the plan update is the structural justice. To me that is a really high ask. It is very, very important. It is good for us to identify it. It is something that we need to work on for many years. We are not going to do that in the next three months.

Ms. Bennett explained: We have talked about it as something that we slowly chip away at.

Commissioner Showalter added: I also really like the idea that you are going back through the BCDC permits and trying to identify how they may have impacted these

communities. That is really good. We may come up with some really interesting examples that we can share with the various workshops we go out to.

Most people do much better if they are given a concrete example of what EJ is. How would you have made it different now that you have lived with it or if you had been asked in the first place?

The other thing I noted reading through these notes is I don't know if we can do it in this process but it is a thing we should think about going forward is figuring out some methodology for compensation. Again and again these experts that you talk to said getting compensation is valuable.

And I know when I have been involved in long, ongoing processes when we have been able to provide an honorarium for sometimes environmental groups or sometimes EJ groups then we really were able to get great interaction. They had some wonderful ideas. But without that it just didn't work. And it wasn't very much money.

I honestly think we could get a grant from I guess there are at least five foundations we could come up with to get a grant for that.

Ms. Bennett continued: And I think there are groups that could help us funnel that stipend money as well so we don't have to jump through all of the bureaucracy around it. From what I have heard, the participation stipend for some of them in the sea level workshops last year money was sent through to these groups to participate through the Resilient Communities Initiative.

There are ways as well that maybe are not as complicated that we could start to explore.

Mr. Goldbeck commented: We haven't had granting foundations and such really interested in giving money to bureaucrats. I think what you are saying is that you would be more open to which is funding folks to interact with us.

Commissioner Showalter added: And it would be very educational for the people who do it. That is good for their professional development as well.

I want to go back to the issue of clear expectations. We really need to get a very succinct description of what we expect from people from these various meetings you go to. I'm sure given what you have created here you won't have any problem doing that.

You really need to make that as one of the jobs in preparing for a meeting in communities is to clearly describe what is the ask from these folks.

I do think in terms of do-ability that getting started on the procedural justice is something we can make a good start on.

Mr. Goldbeck agreed: I totally agree with you. Our staff has a lot of work just trying to do what they are trying to do. The key goal here to amend the Bay Plan policies to include EJ

and these various issues that we will be addressing. It can also make other recommendations in terms of other structural changes to pursue.

We can't do that now because BCDC's budget mainly goes for rent and staff and not much else. There isn't much room to move those things around. What we can do is put together what the state parlance of budget change proposal to go up to the Administration to say, we want to fund this or that and see if we can get those funds.

We obviously couldn't do that now. That is a process that we are actually starting it right now for this year.

We could put that as one of the outputs. We should be thinking about those kinds of things. We can't get there from here now but we certainly shouldn't just drop the whole thing. We should be thinking about what as an ongoing process we should be pursuing.

Planning Manager Fiala commented: Independent of the Bay Plan Amendment process we have our Strategic Plan that we just recently updated. So we are working out how we will actually achieve the objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan.

An outcome of both of these processes could be a broader look at how these communities operate in general and how we might need additional resources to support the changes that are in here.

Commissioner Ahn commented: I think the way that you structured it is smart and being very aware of how the resources are limited here I just have two general thoughts in terms of outreach and leveraging construction.

The first one being is that there is a distinction between service providers and advocates. The slide that you presented dealing with who did you learn from is advocate-heavy which is great. These are really great organizations.

I will put the burden on Commissioners to provide these connections to you. There are service providers who do direct services like environmental mediation and energy efficiency audits. The actual act of serving the communities directly happens to be advocates. As appropriate those are connections that we should provide in the future as well to help augment this outreach.

I am glad that you are leveraging government by engaging with these other agencies and this is great work. I would urge you to think locally as well.

And to Commissioner Showalter's point about the press; that could be potentially a good avenue to increase visibility on this project. That is something that could also be helpful.

Mr. Goldbeck had a question: Has the local San Francisco Department of the Environment been working on some of these areas?

Commissioner Ahn answered: The entire department has adopted an EJ framework for helping develop everything. The scope of the Department of the Environment in San Francisco is quite broad. It handles everything from global energy to zero-waste management.

They used to have a specific EJ team and now they have shifted to this to incorporate an EJ framework into everything that they do which is a really cool approach. This just happened in the last few months.

Ms. Bennett added: I just met a staff member who just started as an environmental justice associate with S.F. Environment. It was interesting to hear how every staff member is taking this on and they are all doing the training together.

Chair Alvarado continued: I wonder if that is even a recommendation that we include in terms of the structural work that reinforces the need for civic institutions to incorporate EJ opportunities and learning within the established structures?

Enforcement Analyst Matthew Trujillo commented: It occurs to me that the Bay Trail and the Water Trail are here in this building. They have a daily interaction with communities and they are all about bringing the public to the Bay and enjoying those resources. Maybe we could invite them to sit in on these meetings.

Ms. Bennett stated: They were also on the list for the workshop.

Commissioner Showalter continued on the subject of outreach: Another possibility for outreach is to have Commissioners go to things. I know that the restrictions under our legislation are a little different than most of the restrictions like the Brown Act.

Mr. Goldbeck stated: I will check with our legal staff. I don't think so. If we had so many Commissioners show up that we had a Brown Act issue at a public hearing we would have to make sure we are acting appropriately.

I don't think so as long as it isn't that we are dealing with ex-parte rules. I don't think that would be an issue here because it is not permit-related it is not regulatory. I think it should be fine. I will check on this.

Chair Alvarado asked: Are we planning to translate these materials into other languages? That feeds into this opportunity around media.

Ms. Bennett explained: Right now we don't have the capacity to do this.

Mr. Goldbeck added: We just don't have the funding to do it. We have actually thought about doing that for the Commission materials and the cost is so high that we didn't do it. We could look into it for this and see if somebody could help us out.

Ms. Bennett stated: The Coastal Commission is moving towards this. Their Commission meeting agendas are translated.

Commissioner Showalter commented: If we had a fact sheet or two that could be translated that would be good. You might have a staff member who speaks Spanish.

Ms. Bennett had concerns: My concern around that is if someone who speaks Spanish reads that and wants to talk to us about it, I don't speak Spanish. There might be some issues around that.

Chair Alvarado continued: It is helpful if we can back it up. Is it useful? At least in San Jose translating things into Vietnamese and Spanish is really important.

Commissioner Ahn added: Locally there are city requirements in the noticing in all of these languages. Language access is a huge issue.

Commissioner Showalter continued: I found too that it is not so much – many of these individuals are quite conversant in English. It is a sign of respect that you cared enough about them to translate it into their language more than they can't read English.

They feel that it is a sign of respect for them to be able to do it in Spanish and be translated.

Mr. Goldbeck commented: Then that raises the question as to which language should be translated since we have a nine-county area.

Commissioner Ahn added: It depends on where you are holding the meeting.

Ms. Bennett commented: I was talking to one of our staff members who works specifically on public access and she was specifically talking about moving away from words and going with symbols that are universal.

That is another idea for public access part of this. Apparently, Australia's public access signage is incredible.

Chair Alvarado added: Australia is amazing in public engagement. The International Association for Public Participation is super strong in Australia.

This organization's spectrum is getting input, consulting and all the way over to empowered. You need to be very clear on what you are offering the community. Are you offering to just inform them? This is not a bad thing. They need to know about where they really have the power to make a decision about something.

Ms. Bennett explained: At the last meeting we talked about this. Can we move to this side of the spectrum a little bit? because that is the hope. A lot of the folks I talked with asked, can you move towards the empowerment.

Mr. Goldbeck added: We will look into translation of some of the materials.

Commissioner Pemberton commented: Our agency has a contact with DTSC and we have used them on a case-by-case basis for translation services and they are affordable. They translated a public access brochure for us into Spanish.

Ms. Bennett continued: That is it on the agenda.

Mr. Goldbeck asked: Is there anything that you think we should stay away from?

6. **Public Comment.** No public comment was given

7. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Chair Alvarado adjourned the meeting at 12:22 p.m.